

REMARKS

In the non-final Office Action, the Examiner maintained the prior restriction requirement, thereby withdrawing claims 1-7 and 17-25 from further consideration; and rejected claims 10-13, 15, 16, and 26-37 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Roberts et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,101,486) in view of Edstrom et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0013827).

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103. Claims 1-7, 10-13, and 15-37 remain pending, of which claims 1-7 and 17-25 have been withdrawn from consideration by the Examiner.

In paragraphs 2-14 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 10-13, 15, 16, and 26-37 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Roberts et al. in view of Edstrom et al. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Independent claim 10 is directed to a method of adding to a first user profile corresponding to a first user a data set retrieved from a second user profile corresponding to a second user in response to a single request made by the first user, where the request corresponds to a URL provided by the second user to the first user and includes a second user identifier corresponding to the second user profile. The method comprises receiving the single request from the first user; using the second user identifier to selectively retrieve the data set from the second user profile; determining if the single request includes a cookie that is associated with the first user profile; and adding the data set to the first user profile in response to determining that the single request includes the cookie that is associated with the first user profile.

Neither Roberts et al. nor Edstrom et al., whether taken alone or in any reasonable combination, disclose or suggests the combination of features recited in amended claim 10. For example, Roberts et al. and Edstrom et al. do not disclose or suggest receiving a single request

from a first user, where the request corresponds to a URL provided by a second user to the first user and includes a second user identifier corresponding to a second user profile.

The Examiner alleged that Roberts et al. discloses these features and cited column 2, lines 50-59, of Roberts et al. for support (Office Action, page 2). Applicants respectfully disagree.

At column 2, lines 50-59, Roberts et al. discloses:

Another method, consistent with this invention, for customizing a website in accordance with user profile information includes several steps. Initially, a plurality of user identification data is received and used to create a user profile. The user profile is retrieved from a profile database when a call from the user is received. Thereafter, the user profile is compared to marketing material maintained by the company and a dynamic content message is generated. A webpage is configured for display by inserting the dynamic content message into the webpage.

In this section, Roberts et al. discloses a technique for customizing a web page based on information in a user profile. Nowhere in this section, or elsewhere, does Roberts et al. disclose or suggest receiving a single request from a first user, where the request corresponds to a URL provided by a second user to the first user and includes a second user identifier corresponding to a second user profile, as required by claim 10. Edstrom et al. also does not disclose these features.

Roberts et al. and Edstrom et al. also do not disclose or suggest using the second user identifier, received in the single request from the first user, to selectively retrieve a data set from the second user profile, as further recited in claim 10. The Examiner alleged that Roberts et al. discloses this feature and cited column 6, lines 21-35, of Roberts et al. for support (Office Action, page 2). Applicants respectfully disagree.

At column 6, lines 21-35, Roberts et al. discloses:

When the customer contacts (i.e., visits or accesses) the company website (Step 410), the customer profile is retrieved from profile database 170 by ACD device 155 (Step 420). Webpages of the company's site displayed on customer terminal 110 will include both static and dynamic material. The static material acts as a template for the displayed webpage image and includes, for example javascripts[™], CGI scripts, JAVA[™] applets, etc. These scripts have instructions for retrieving various dynamic content messages and

displaying them on customer terminal 110 when the customer is viewing the company's website. To display the webpages on customer terminal 110, web browser 120 retrieves the static content (i.e., the website template) from NSP apparatus 130 and displays it on customer terminal 110 (Step 430).

In this section, Roberts et al. discloses that when a user accesses a web site, the user's profile is retrieved and web pages, that include both static and dynamic material, are displayed to the user. Nowhere in this section, or elsewhere, does Roberts et al. disclose or suggest using a second user identifier, received in a single request from a first user, to selectively retrieve a data set from a second user profile, as required by claim 10. Edstrom et al. also does not disclose this feature.

Roberts et al. and Edstrom et al. also do not disclose or suggest determining if the single request includes a cookie that is associated with a first user profile, as further recited in claim 10. The Examiner admitted that Roberts et al. does not disclose this feature, but alleged that Edstrom et al. discloses this feature and cited paragraph 0021 of Edstrom et al. for support (Office Action, page 3). Applicants respectfully disagree.

At paragraph 0021, Edstrom et al. discloses:

The managers may include a Logon Manager that handles the logon procedures enabling an end-user to access information relating to the end-user; an End-User Service Provisioning Manager that administers provision of services to end-users; a User Profile Manager that inserts, deletes, modifies, and reads end-user profile data in a common directory; a Presentation Proxies Manager that provides adjustable user interfaces to end-users; an Application/Service Discovery Manager that handles discovery of applications and services by interfacing to the at least one application server; and an End-User Service Data Manager that handles service-related data.

In this section, Edstrom et al. discloses logon procedures for enabling an end-user to access information relating to the end-user. Nowhere in this section, or elsewhere, does Edstrom et al. even mention a cookie, let alone determining if a single request includes a cookie that is associated with a first user profile, as required by claim 10. Roberts et al. also does not disclose this feature.

Roberts et al. and Edstrom et al. also do not disclose or suggest adding the data set from the second user profile to the first user profile in response to determining that the single request includes the cookie that is associated with the first user profile, as further recited in claim 10. The Examiner alleged that Roberts et al. discloses this feature and cited column 5, lines 16-24, of Roberts et al. for support (Office Action, page 2). Applicants respectfully disagree.

At column 5, lines 16-24, Roberts et al. discloses:

When the identification information is received from the user, it is logged and stored by web browser 120 (Step 310). Web browser 120 logs the customer's input operations using a "cookie" or other information logging techniques that are known by those skilled in the art. In addition to the active input operations described above, the cookie may log the customer's passive activity (i.e., time spent viewing a particular webpage, entry through a particular banner, etc.) to gather information about the customer's interest.

In this section, Roberts et al. discloses using a cookie to log a customer's input operation, including the customer's passive activity. Nowhere in this section, or elsewhere, does Roberts et al. disclose or suggest adding a data set from a second user profile to a first user profile in response to determining that the single request includes a cookie that is associated with the first user profile, as required by claim 10. Edstrom et al. also does not disclose this feature.

For at least these reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 10 is patentable over Roberts et al. and Edstrom et al., whether taken alone or in any reasonable combination. Claims 11-13, 15, 16, 32, and 33 depend from claim 10 and are, therefore, patentable over Roberts et al. and Edstrom et al. for at least the reasons given with regard to claim 10. Claims 11-13, 15, 16, 32, and 33 are also patentable over Roberts et al. and Edstrom et al. for reasons of their own.

For example, claim 11 recites using a parameter specified in a URL to selectively retrieve the data set from the second user profile. The Examiner alleged that Roberts et al. discloses this feature and cited column 2, lines 53-63, of Roberts et al. for support (Office Action, page 4). Applicants disagree.

At column 2, lines 52-63, Roberts et al. discloses:

Initially, a plurality of user identification data is received and used to create a user profile. The user profile is retrieved from a profile database when a call from the user is received. Thereafter, the user profile is compared to marketing material maintained by the company and a dynamic content message is generated. A webpage is configured for display by inserting the dynamic content message into the webpage.

A system, consistent with the present invention, for providing a customized webpage to a website maintained by a server apparatus, the system including a transaction center in data communication with the server apparatus.

In this section, Roberts et al. discloses a technique for customizing a web page based on information in a user profile. Nowhere in this section, or elsewhere, does Roberts et al. disclose or suggest using a parameter specified in a URL to selectively retrieve the data set from the second user profile, as required by claim 11. Edstrom et al. also does not disclose this feature.

For at least these additional reasons, Applicants submit that claim 11 is patentable over Roberts et al. and Edstrom et al.

Claim 12 requires using the second user identifier to selectively retrieve a name and a telephone number from the second user profile. The Examiner alleged that Roberts et al. discloses this feature and cited column 2, lines 53-63, of Roberts et al. for support (Office Action, page 4). Applicants disagree.

Column 2, lines 52-63, of Roberts et al. is reproduced above. In this section, Roberts et al. discloses a technique for customizing a web page based on information in a user profile. Nowhere in this section, or elsewhere, does Roberts et al. disclose or suggest using the second user identifier to selectively retrieve a name and a telephone number from the second user profile, as required by claim 12. Edstrom et al. also does not disclose this feature.

For at least these additional reasons, Applicants submit that claim 12 is patentable over Roberts et al. and Edstrom et al.

Claim 13 requires using the second user identifier to selectively retrieve a vCard from the second user profile. The Examiner alleged that Roberts et al. discloses this feature and cited column 2, lines 53-63, of Roberts et al. for support (Office Action, page 4). Applicants disagree.

Column 2, lines 52-63, of Roberts et al. is reproduced above. In this section, Roberts et al. discloses a technique for customizing a web page based on information in a user profile.

Nowhere in this section, or elsewhere, does Roberts et al. disclose or suggest using the second user identifier to selectively retrieve a vCard from the second user profile, as required by claim 13. Edstrom et al. also does not disclose this feature.

For at least these additional reasons, Applicants submit that claim 13 is patentable over Roberts et al. and Edstrom et al.

Claim 15 requires using a user-ID corresponding to the second user, received in the single request from the first user, to selectively retrieve a data set from the second user profile. The Examiner alleged that Edstrom et al. discloses this feature and cited paragraph 0060 of Edstrom et al. for support (Office Action, page 4). Applicants disagree.

At paragraph 0060, Edstrom et al. discloses:

User profile data is mainly information regarding the characteristics of an end-user such as a telephone system subscriber, that is to say, basic user/subscription data associated with the end-user's PSE profile. For example, user profile data may include personal data (e.g., name, social insurance number, age, sex), one or more logical identifiers (e.g., logical name, personal telephone number(s), e-mail address(es)), authentication data (e.g., password, pin, voiceprint and other biometric data), and service-independent preferences (e.g., preferred language, billing information, biometric data). In addition, user profile data also contains a list of references and searchable keys to all services, which are subscribed to by the end-user.

In this section, Edstrom et al. discloses information that might be included as user profile data.

Nowhere in this section, or elsewhere, does Edstrom et al. disclose or suggest using a user-ID corresponding to a second user, received in a single request from a first user, to selectively

retrieve a data set from a second user profile, as required by claim 15. Roberts et al. also does not disclose this feature.

For at least these additional reasons, Applicants submit that claim 15 is patentable over Roberts et al. and Edstrom et al.

Claim 16 requires using telephone identifying information corresponding to the second user, received in the single request from the first user, to selectively retrieve a data set from the second user profile. The Examiner alleged that Edstrom et al. discloses this feature and cited paragraph 0060 of Edstrom et al. for support (Office Action, page 4). Applicants disagree.

Paragraph 0060 of Edstrom et al. is reproduced above. In this section, Edstrom et al. discloses information that might be included as user profile data. Nowhere in this section, or elsewhere, does Edstrom et al. disclose or suggest using telephone identifying information corresponding to a second user, received in a single request from a first user, to selectively retrieve a data set from a second user profile, as required by claim 16. Roberts et al. also does not disclose this feature.

For at least these additional reasons, Applicants submit that claim 16 is patentable over Roberts et al. and Edstrom et al.

Independent claim 26 is directed to a system that comprises means for receiving an incoming call from a caller; means for detecting telephone identifying information from the incoming call; means for accessing a user profile based on the telephone identifying information; means for receiving a message from the caller; means for prompting the caller for a target telephone destination for the message; means for receiving the target telephone destination; means for determining a target telephone number corresponding to the target telephone destination; means for providing the caller with an option to enter the target telephone number in the user profile when the target telephone number does not correspond to an existing telephone

number entry in the user profile; and means for storing at least one of the target telephone destination or the target telephone number in the user profile in response to selection of the option by the caller.

Neither Roberts et al. nor Edstrom et al., whether taken alone or in any reasonable combination, disclose or suggests the combination of features recited in amended claim 26. For example, Roberts et al. and Edstrom et al. do not disclose or suggest means for receiving a message from the caller and means for prompting the caller for a target telephone destination for the message.

The Examiner alleged that Edstrom et al. discloses these features and cited paragraph 0067 of Edstrom et al. for support (Office Action, pages 4-5). Applicants respectfully disagree.

At paragraph 0067, Edstrom et al. discloses:

As seen in FIG. 6, the HLR and a User Mobility Server ("UMS"), which are SCSs, retain service profile data and service data, as do Application Servers such as email and an OSA application, but user profile data that would have been retained in these devices is centralized in the CUPD. Access to the CUPD can be via a SQL/JDBC interface from an LDAP-Server, which communicates via the LDAP with LDAP clients (protocol translators) and suitable APIs, and therethrough with the PSEM and other functionalities. The UMS typically provides functionality for handling multimedia profiles while the HLR handles telephone-type profiles. It will be recognized that the e-mail and OSA applications illustrated in FIG. 6 are not the only possibilities, as indicated by the block labeled "Directory Enabled Applications".

In this section, Edstrom et al. discloses that the CUPD retains user profile data. Nowhere in this section, or elsewhere, does Edstrom et al. disclose or suggest means for receiving a message from the caller and means for prompting the caller for a target telephone destination for the message, as required by claim 26. Roberts et al. also does not disclose these features.

Roberts et al. and Edstrom et al. also do not disclose or suggest means for receiving the target telephone destination; means for determining a target telephone number corresponding to the target telephone destination; and means for providing the caller with an option to enter the target telephone number in the user profile when the target telephone number does not

correspond to an existing telephone number entry in the user profile, as further recited in claim

26. The Examiner alleged that Roberts et al. discloses these features and cited column 4, lines 33-43, of Roberts et al. for support (Office Action, page 5). Applicants disagree.

At column 4, lines 33-43, Roberts et al. discloses:

This profile information may include any number of identifying characteristics, such as a customer name, address, company affiliation, e-mail address, phone number, customer account information, fax number, etc. In addition, the customer profile information may include other useful data, such as previous purchases and a listing of products and services currently owned by the customer. The products owned may be directly entered into the profile or may be products ordered by the company, and therefore recorded or logged into the company's database. Further, the profile information includes any product selections the customer makes while visiting the website.

In this section, Roberts et al. discloses data that may be included in a user's profile information.

Nowhere in this section, or elsewhere, does Roberts et al. disclose or suggest means for receiving the target telephone destination; means for determining a target telephone number corresponding to the target telephone destination; and means for providing the caller with an option to enter the target telephone number in the user profile when the target telephone number does not correspond to an existing telephone number entry in the user profile, as required by claim 26.

Edstrom et al. also does not disclose these features.

Roberts et al. and Edstrom et al. also do not disclose or suggest means for storing at least one of the target telephone destination or the target telephone number, which corresponds to the destination of a message received from a caller, in the user profile in response to selection of the option by the caller, as further recited in claim 26. The Examiner alleged that Edstrom et al. discloses these features and cited paragraph 0060 of Edstrom et al. for support (Office Action, page 5). Applicants disagree.

Paragraph 0060 of Edstrom et al. is reproduced above. In this section, Edstrom et al. discloses information that might be included as user profile data. Nowhere in this section, or elsewhere, does Edstrom et al. disclose or suggest means for storing at least one of the target

telephone destination or the target telephone number, which corresponds to the destination of a message received from a caller, in the user profile in response to selection of the option by the caller, as required claim 26. Roberts et al. also does not disclose this feature.

For at least these reasons, Applicants submit that claim 26 is patentable over Roberts et al. and Edstrom et al., whether taken alone or in any reasonable combination. Claims 27-30 depend from claim 26 and are, therefore, patentable over Roberts et al. and Edstrom et al. for at least the reasons given with regard to claim 26. Claims 27-30 also recite additional features not disclosed or suggested by Roberts et al. or Edstrom et al.

For example, claim 27 recites means for adding content to a beginning or end of the message and means for transmitting the message with the added content based on the target telephone number. Neither Roberts et al. nor Edstrom et al. discloses or suggests the combination of features recited in claim 27.

The Examiner alleged that Roberts et al. discloses these features and cited column 2, lines 42-48, of Roberts et al. for support (Office Action, page 5). Applicants disagree.

At column 2, lines 41-49, Roberts et al. discloses:

Further, the profile information includes any product selections the customer makes while visiting the website.

If, for example, the customer selects a product from an on-line catalog, the selection is logged so that the CSR will know the product researched (i.e., through the selection of websites or catalog entries) or selected by the customer's actions while visiting the website when the transaction center is contacted.

In this section, Roberts et al. discloses a user's profile information includes any product selections the user makes while visiting a web site. Nowhere in this section, or elsewhere, does Roberts et al. disclose or suggest means for adding content to a beginning or end of a message or means for transmitting the message with the added content based on the target telephone number, as required by claim 27. Edstrom et al. also does not disclose these features.

For at least these additional reasons, Applicants submit that claim 27 is patentable over Roberts et al. and Edstrom et al. Claims 28-30 depend from claim 27 and are, therefore, also patentable over Roberts et al. and Edstrom et al. for at least the reasons given with regard to claim 27.

Independent claim 31 is directed to a system. The system comprises a voice portal to receive an incoming call from a caller, receive a message from the caller, prompt the caller for a target telephone destination for the message, receive the target telephone destination, determine a target telephone number corresponding to the target telephone destination, output the message as a message delivery call based on the target telephone number, detect an answer to the message delivery call, when a destination party answers the message delivery call, provide the destination party with an option to listen to or dispose of the message, and when an answering machine answers the message delivery call, provide information to the answering machine that a message is waiting from the caller.

Neither Roberts et al. nor Edstrom et al., whether taken alone or in any reasonable combination, discloses or suggests the combination of features recited in claim 31. For example, Roberts et al. and Edstrom et al. do not disclose or suggest a voice portal that, among other things, outputs a message as a message delivery call based on a target telephone number, detects an answer to the message delivery call, when a destination party answers the message delivery call, provides the destination party with an option to listen to or dispose of the message, and/or when an answering machine answers the message delivery call, provides information to the answering machine that a message is waiting from the caller.

The Examiner did not address these features and, therefore, did not establish a prima facie case of obviousness with regard to claim 31.

For at least these reasons, Applicants submit that claim 31 is patentable over Roberts et al. and Edstrom et al., whether taken alone or in any reasonable combination.

Independent claims 34 and 37 recite features similar to, but possibly different in scope from, features recited in claim 10. Claims 34 and 37 are, therefore, patentable over Roberts et al. and Edstrom et al., whether taken alone or in any reasonable combination, for at least reasons similar to reasons given with regard to claim 10. Claims 35 and 36 depend from claim 34 and are, therefore, patentable over Roberts et al. and Edstrom et al. for at least the reasons given with regard to claim 34.

In view of the foregoing remarks, Applicants respectfully request the reconsideration and allowance of the pending claims.

As Applicants' remarks with respect to the Examiner's rejections overcome the rejections, Applicants' silence as to certain assertions by the Examiner in the Office Action or certain requirements that may be applicable to such rejections (e.g., whether a reference constitutes prior art, motivation to combine references, etc.) is not a concession by Applicants that such assertions are accurate or that such requirements have been met, and Applicants reserve the right to dispute these assertions/requirements in the future.

If the Examiner does not believe that all pending claims are now in condition for allowance, the Examiner is urged to contact the undersigned to expedite prosecution of this application.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 50-1070 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

HARRITY SNYDER, LLP

By: /Paul A. Harrity/
Paul A. Harrity
Reg. No. 39,574

11350 Random Hills Road
Suite 600
Fairfax, Virginia 22030
(571) 432-0800

Date: August 31, 2006